

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 12, 2010 has been received and reviewed. Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 17-20, and 23 are in the case. Claims 4-8, 20, and 23 stand rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 17-20, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

By this paper, claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10, 17-20, and 23 have been amended and claims 24 and 25 have been added. For the reasons set forth below, claims 1, 2, 4-13, 17-20, and 23-25 are believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 4-8, 20, and 23 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claims 4-8, 20, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the claims “parsing” in a manner that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, has possession of the claim invention. After comparing the language of the claims to the disclosures of the specification, Applicant must respectfully disagree.

Applicant finds in the detailed description of Figures 10 and 11 clear disclosure of creating XML pages and interpreting XML pages. In the claims at issue, Applicant had used “parsing” to describe the process of inserting XML tags into a document to delimited or breakup the document into certain constituent parts. While the specification may not use the word “parsing” to describing this creating process, the specification nonetheless evidences possession of it.

However, Applicant does note that the specification discloses a “page parser 298” tasked with interpreting XML pages. Accordingly, to remove any ambiguity that may arise from the use of “parsing” for the creating step in the claims and a “parser” for the interpreting step in the specification, Applicant has, by this paper, amended the claims at issue to remove the “parsing” language therefrom. Reconsideration is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 17-20, and 23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 17-20, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of sub-combinations of Hall, Fields, Curriculum Sequencing, ABA, Danner, Eguchi, and Oni. However, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Office Action must first find all of the claimed elements, then provide clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. *See* MPEP 2143. With respect to the newly amended claims, the Office Action does not do this.

Specifically, nowhere in any combination or sub-combination of Hall, Fields, Curriculum Sequencing, ABA, Danner, Eguchi, and Oni does Applicant find any disclosure of determining equivalencies between courses before receiving any inputs from a student to whom those equivalencies pertain. For example, the Office Action asserts that Fields discloses determining equivalencies between courses. However, in Figures 2 and 5, the system of Fields clearly requires inputs from a student before any equivalencies can be determined. Accordingly, the Office Action has not found all of the elements recited in Applicant’s newly amended claims as required. *See* MPEP 2143.

Additionally, nowhere in any combination or sub-combination of Hall, Fields, Curriculum Sequencing, ABA, Danner, Eguchi, and Oni does Applicant find any disclosure of

determining sets of equivalencies as recited in newly amended claim 19 (and newly added claims 24, and 25). Accordingly, the Office Action has not found all of the elements recited in Applicant's newly amended (and added) claims as would be required to maintain the present rejection. *See* MPEP 2143.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant asserts that the Office Action fails to meet its burden with respect to the claims as amended by this paper. Reconsideration of claims 1, 2, 4-13, 17-20, and 23 and consideration of claim 24 and 25 is, therefore, respectfully requested.

In the event that the examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of any of these claims, which could be clarified in a telephone conference, the examiner is respectfully urged to initiate the same with the undersigned.

DATED this 12th day of April, 2010.

Respectfully submitted,

/A. John Pate 2456-2-13-1 100412/

A. John Pate
Reg. No. 36,234
Customer No. 28049
Attorney for Applicant